

MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612)  
United States Attorney

MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)  
Chief, Criminal Division

LOWELL C. POWELL (CABN 235446)  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7368  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234  
E-Mail: lowell.powell2@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
RODRIGO AKE MEDINA, )  
a/k/a Rodrigo Medina, )  
 )  
Defendant. )

No. CR 10-0839 RS

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18  
U.S.C. § 3161**

On May 31, 2011, the parties in this case appeared before the Court. At that time, the Court continued the matter to June 28, 2011. The Court later issued an order resetting the matter to July 12, 2011. The parties have agreed to exclude the period of time between May 31, 2011, and July 12, 2011, from any time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The parties represented that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

///

1 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). At the hearing, the Court made findings consistent with this  
2 agreement.

3 SO STIPULATED:

4  
5 MELINDA HAAG  
United States Attorney

6  
7 DATED: June 27, 2011

8 /s/  
LOWELL C. POWELL  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

9  
10 DATED: June 27, 2011

11 /s/  
GARRICK S. LEW  
Attorney for RODRIGO AKE MEDINA

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

For the reasons stated above and at the May 31, 2011 hearing, the Court finds that the exclusion from the time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 of the period from May 31, 2011 through July 12, 2011 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(A). Denying the requested exclusion of time would deprive the parties of the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 6/27/11



\_\_\_\_\_  
THE HONORABLE RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge